

PANEL #6:

What do we need to do to realize the School of Medicine facilities expansion and renewal?

1. Should we proceed with a plan that requires some of our research programs to be offsite – whether at the VA, North Campus or elsewhere?

Summary of Comments:

- It would be optimal to be physically situated in the same location. If this is not feasible, then the linkage between sites is critical. Traveling between sites will not work. Need to combine entities at each site.
- Planning has focused on not breaking links with similar investigators.
- Other concerns include the loss of collaborative opportunities and impacts on the recruitment of top residents and fellows.
- Can academic faculty be moved off-campus without losing the academic base? Can outpatient care move without moving the academic core?
- It could work if it was built with clinical research integrated. The challenge will be for BSc and how strongly it is managed. Collaboration with other scientists is key to their success.
- For most of basic research that requires graduate students, it will be very difficult to make this work.
- There is an appreciable difference in travel time between the North Campus and the VA.
- Need to be careful about programming for adequate shared facilities.

2. How can we approach the use and management of SUMC space in new ways that will ensure its mutually beneficial and efficient use?

Summary of Comments:

- Biochemistry model:
 - Small core individual lab and larger shared labs.
 - Fosters a collaborative atmosphere – sharing of ideas, equipment, etc.
 - Flexibility is great but also requires cooperation supported by a “social family” feeling among the faculty.
 - Model works when you have groups that get along and work well together.
 - Collaborations lead to multi-site research.
- Need to think about our policies that define departmental space – will allow people to engage better in space planning for new facilities.

3. **The facilities plan is bold and significant – but also very expensive. What are the risks for proceeding with a plan that will require major fundraising as well as support from the Dean's Office, departments and the University?**

Summary of Comments:

- Currently looking for new and creative fundraising opportunities. Very tough fundraising landscape, including competing internal priorities, competing SUMC priorities, competing SU priorities, competing AMC (UCSF, CPMC) priorities, and competing donor interests.
- Master Plan offers a very bold vision that is very exciting to donors. Need to sell the integrated plan as a vehicle to attract funds for individual projects.
- Projecting 35-40% of capital will be from non-donor sources.
- SCVI included in SIM2, SHC, LPCH and Program goals.
- Currently assessing the mix of departmental reserves – their status and how they can be used to help support faculty recruitment.
- Nobel Prize winners have buoyed development prospects.
- Venture capital community and biotech founders were engaged at Mission Bay and are being targeted here.
- High-tech founders may be more inclined to engage.